

**REMARKS**

Claims 10-29 are remain pending in this application with claims 10 and 23 being amended by this response.

Claims 10 and 23 have been amended to recite that the images produced for display are blocked according to the view profile when the select program is unblocked support for this amendment is found throughout the specification and specifically on page 5, lines 6-11 and page 7 lines 15-27.

**Rejection of Claims 10-17, 19 and 21-29 under 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 10-17, 19 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Collings (US Patent # 5,828,402) in view of Ford (US Patent # 6,181,364).

The present claimed invention recites a method and system for selectively blocking viewing of television programs. A video signal processor produces an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce a plurality of images for display to at least one viewer. A supervisor control system is provided which is operable by a supervisor to create at least one viewer profile identifying images to be blocked from display to the at least one viewer. The supervisor control system allows for selection of a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to the viewer profile, thereby unblocking the select program while the other of the plurality of images produced for display are still blocked according to the viewer profile. Upon completion of the select program, the supervisor control system continues to control viewing according to the at least one viewer profile.

The present claimed invention is directed towards a blocking system. Current blocking systems contain a plurality of options and categories in which to limit the viewing of content. However, in present blocking systems if one desire's to watch a

specific program one must disable, reset or change viewer profiles (Page 4, lines 1-12). Therefore, the present claimed invention provides an “an improvement which permits the supervisor to enter one or more...specific programs to be viewed” (Page 5, lines 1-2). By entering a program to be viewed the system places the selected program outside the limits set in the active user profile. Accordingly, a selected program which had previously been labeled as “blocked” is now exempt from the limits of the user profile and becomes viewable, unblocked. However, the ratings and blocking settings for the other programs remain active, as to provide the set blocking preferences to all other programs. Once the selected program is completed all the limits set forth in the viewer profile once again apply to **all** the programs available.

Collings is directed to selectively blocking audio and video signals based upon a comparison of the contents of data packets transmitted with a television signal to stored preferences. The user is provided a menu which allows for the enabling, disabling and temporarily disabling of a single or multiple of the available blocking features. When a user wishes to view a program currently restricted by one of the multiple stored blocking preferences the user must enter the main menu and temporarily disable all the features containing limits applying to the selected program (Col. 17, lines 1-32). The length of the period in which the set limits are temporarily disabled is chosen by the user and input in the main menu (Fig. 5B).

The Examiner suggests that Collings describes a supervisor control system operable to select a program having a rating above a set blocking rating such that the select program is unblocked. However, Collings do not teach selecting a program such that the selected program is unblocked. The system of Collings requires that to watch a restricted program one must disable all applicable blocking functions to the specified program. Essentially, Collings does not disclose the selection of a program to be unblocked (unblocked meaning to be fully unrestricted to the user), rather Collings disclose the selection of blocking preferences to be disabled. This is unlike the present invention, for the present invention selects a program to be unblocked and displayed to the user. Collings merely allows for the supervisor to disable existing restrictions.

Therefore, Collings neither discloses nor suggests “to **select a specific program** having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is **unblocked** while the other of the plurality of images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile” as claimed in claims 10 and 23 of the present invention.

Additionally, the Examiner suggests that Collings describes that, upon completion of a selected program, the supervisor control system identifies programs to be blocked according to the at least one viewer profile. However, Collings disclose that in order to watch a program which exceeds the set ratings one must enter the menu and either disable or temporarily disable the applicable blocking features. If the features were **disabled**, then the at least one user profile will have been **altered** and upon completion of the program desired programs will be blocked in accordance with the **new altered** at least one user profile. If the features were **temporarily disabled**, then the system would block programs according the original at least one user profile **only after** the pre-entered disable time length. This is unlike the present invention which blocks programs **upon completion** of the selected program according to the **original** at least one user profile. Therefore, Collings neither discloses nor suggests “whereby upon **completion of said select program**, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile” as claimed in claims 10 and 23 of present invention.

Ford describes a system for filtering out potentially objectionable content from a video. The videos to be filtered contain embedded information that identifies potentially objectionable substitution events. The system determines which substitution events are to be filtered out based on selectable rating settings. Ford is not concerned with selecting a program to be viewed over an at least one viewer profile without changing the at least one viewer profile as in the present claimed invention. In fact, Ford, similarly to Collings, neither discloses nor suggests “to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked while the other of the plurality of

images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile” as claimed in claims 10 and 23 of present invention.

Additionally, Ford is not concerned with returning to the normal function of the at least one user profile upon completion of the selected program. Therefore, Ford, similarly to Collings, neither discloses nor suggests “whereby **upon completion of said select program**, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile” as claimed in claims 10 and 23 of present invention.

As neither Collings nor Ford when taken alone or in combination disclose “select[ing] a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked while all other images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile, whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system continues to control viewing according to the at least one viewer profile” as claimed in claims 10 and 23 of the present claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that the present claimed invention is patentable over the combination of Collings and Ford.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Collings or Ford, when taken alone or in combination, showing the above discussed features. As claims 10-17, 19, 21-22 and 24-29 are dependent on claims 10 and 23, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also patentable over Collings and Ford, when taken alone or in combination. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claim 18 and 20 under 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claim 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collings in view of Ford in further view of West et al.(US Patent # 5,552,575).

West et al. describe a viewer discretion television program control system including devices and methods for controlling access to television viewing. Multiple user allocation of permissible viewings times and program content are under the control of a system supervisor. However, West et al. are not directed towards selecting a program to be viewed over an at least one viewer profile without changing the at least one viewer profile as in the present claimed invention. In fact, West et al, similarly to Collings and Ford, neither disclose nor suggest selecting a “specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked while all other images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile” as claimed in independent claim 10 of present invention.

Additionally, West et al. is not concerned with returning to the normal function of the at least one user profile upon completion of the selected program. Therefore, West et al., similarly to Collings and Ford, neither disclose nor suggest “whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile” as claimed in independent claim 10 of present invention.

The Examiner suggests that West et al. were cited to show multiple profiles for different users as well as overrides for each profile. However, similarly to Collings and Ford, West et al. neither disclose nor suggest selecting a “specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked while all other images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile, whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile” as in the present claimed invention. West et al. disclose entering exclusion codes for programs or groups of programs. However, West et al. neither disclose nor suggest selection of a specific program as claimed in independent claim 10.

As neither Collings, Ford nor West et al. when taken alone or in combination disclose selecting a “specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked while all other images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile, whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system continues to control viewing according to the at least one viewer profile” as claimed in claims 10 of the present claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that the present claimed invention is patentable over the combination of Collings, Ford and West et al. As claims 18 and 20 are dependant on claim 10 it is respectfully submitted that they are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above in regards to claim 10.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Collings, Ford or West et al., when taken alone or in combination, showing the above discussed features. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.


Application No. 09/475,448

Attorney Docket No. RCA89385

No additional fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Johnston Lynch

By:



Jackie Jay Schwartz  
Registration No. 34,721  
Telephone No.: (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operations  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312  
July 7, 2005

Application No. 09/475,448



Attorney Docket No. RCA89385

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: July 7, 2005

Karen Schlauch